

**From:** Monique Gennari  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 1:01am  
**Subject:** Against Microsoft Settlement

I am unhappy with the proposed Microsoft settlement as it does little to protect the companies that were harmed, which is necessary to restore competition to the software industry. I am a Mac user, which is one of the last realistic choices if one does not want to use Windows. Problem is Microsoft has a history of forcing Apple to stop competing in exchange for software or services that Apple needs to stay in business. One example is Microsoft Office. People will not switch to Macs (or continue to use them) if they know that they will have problems communicating with Windows users. Microsoft has made Apple give up technology, and stop using software such as Netscape's to as a condition to continue making Office. This is even though Office on the Mac is profitable for Microsoft. If Apple does not have Office, Apple will eventually die as a company. I will then be forced to use a platform I really do not like. Office started on a Mac, please keep it there.

Microsoft should be forced to make Office for the Mac, as it is a sword over Apple's head. Furthermore, Microsoft should be forced to make feature for feature versions of software such as Internet Explorer for the Mac. This is important because Microsoft effectively killed Netscape (a company that did make matching version of its software for multiple platforms), and is making browsers for the Mac that many websites will not recognize. In other words Microsoft is not giving Mac users the same features that Windows users have. Some of these features are necessary to use some sites. Netscape never did this. If people cannot rely on the Mac platform to access the internet, people will abandon it even though they do not want to. If Apple did not have to worry about these threats it could concentrate on technology which would compete with Microsoft's without the fear of being forced out of business. Keep in mind that Microsoft is making money off Mac products.

I also think that any settlement should force Microsoft to unbundle competing software that other companies made popular and at one point were making a profit from. Two examples of these types of products would be Explorer (as Netscape made the browser popular), and Windows Media player (as Real Networks and Apple's Quicktime were the popular choices). It should be made clear that in the future such products should be unbundled, and Microsoft should charge people for the software if other companies invented the original software that Microsoft was competing with and these companies had to charge for it.

Microsoft should also be forced to support Java, as doing so would enable programs to write programs that could be used on multiple platforms (Linux, the Mac, Windows, Unix, etc.).

Finally Microsoft should be supervised by a panel of people or a single person who had the direct power to enforce any settlement without having to jump

through hoops to force compliance. Basically I agree with many of the suggestions that the dissenting states have provided, even though in some areas I think they need to even go a little further.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Thomas Paluchniak

"In matters of style swim with the current. In matters of principle stand like a rock."

Thomas Jefferson